DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 067 SP 027 395

AUTHOR Tom, Alan R.
TITLE The Case for Maintaining Teacher Education at the Undergraduate Level.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 40p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Length
IDENTIFIERS *Extended Degree Programs

ABSTRACT

A case is made for maintaining teacher education at the undergraduate level. This paper outlines the core arguments used by contemporary proponents of extended teacher preparation programs, and identifies which of these arguments are recurrent themes from earlier rationales. The validity of the arguments is also assessed. Some of the hidden costs of mandating extended teacher preparation programs as the sole approach to the preparation of teachers are identified and evaluated. It is argued that the key issue is improving the quality of teacher education, and that this may be done within four-year, as well as extended, teacher preparation programs. The issue of whether four year or extended programs are best for teacher preparation will remain for many years; both structures should be possible and effective. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED267067

Revised 3/86

THE CASE FOR MAINTAINING TEACHER EDUCATION AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL

Alan R. Tom

Department of Education

Washington University

St. Louis, MO 63130

Prepared for the

Coalition of Teacher Education Programs

March 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. R. Tom

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 027 395

For over fifty years teacher educators and policy analysts have periodically discussed the relative merits of four-year teacher preparation and of various forms of extended teacher preparation (e.g., Cogan, 1955; Counts, 1935; Denemark and Nutter, 1984; Holmes, 1937; Murray, 1982; Smith, 1980; Winetrout, 1963; Woodring, 1957). While most of this literature is supportive of the concept of extending initial teacher preparation beyond the baccalaureate degree, most teachers continue to be prepared within the context of undergraduate education.

Now, as we enter the second half of the 1980s, arguments for moving to extended teacher preparation are more widespread than ever, though many of these arguments have roots which go back fifty or more years. One major task of this paper is to outline the core arguments used by contemporary proponents of extended teacher preparation, to identify which of these arguments are recurrent themes from earlier rationales, and to evaluate the validity of these arguments. A second major purpose of this paper is to identify and assess some of the hidden costs of mandating extended teacher preparation as the sole approach to the preparation of teachers. The third major task of this paper is to argue why it is proper to maintain four-year as well as extended teacher preparation.

The Arguments for Extended Teacher Preparation

Two questions are of concern as we address this topic: which arguments have been appealed to most frequently and what is meant by extended teacher preparation? Unfortunately, extended preparation comes in many forms. For example, most extended preparation programs entail a Master's degree (e.g., Smith, Carroll, & Fry, 1984; White, 1985), but a few award only partial credit toward a Master's degree (e.g., Dunbar, 1981; Scannell & Guenther, 1981). Some extended programs entail considerable professional work during the initial four years of study (e.g., Andrew, 1981; Dunbar, 1981; White, 1985) while other designs assume that the applicant does little or no professional study until the graduate program commences (e.g., Boyer, 1983, pp. 174-178; Gideonse, 1984). Internships sometimes play a prominent role in extended programs (e.g., Andrew, 1981; White, 1985), while in other cases clinical work does not involve internships (e.g., Smith, Carroll, & Fry, 1984) and may even include the first year of teaching (e.g., Dunbar, 1981). Thus, we are much less sure what structure is involved when we refer to extended teacher preparation than when we speak of four-year teacher preparation.

Rationales for extended programs, however, are less varied than are the structural arrangements of these programs. Thus we can identify and assess these rationales without too much concern whether internships are involved, whether a degree results from a

particular program, or whether professional work is largely restricted to the graduate portion of the program. In those cases when it is important to discuss the structure of an extended program, I will assume that an internship is present, that professional work is heavily concentrated at the graduate level, and that a Master's degree is granted at the conclusion of the program. I am specifying the structure of an extended program in this way because these features increasingly appear to be the norm among proponents of extended teacher preparation. But I will not be making many references to the structure of extended programs, as the focus of this paper is on the arguments for extended programs, the persistence of these arguments over time, and the extent to which these arguments are compelling.

While many specific arguments are made to defend the superiority of extended programs over four-year ones, these arguments tend to fall into two broad categories. One category of argument can be characterized as the "inadequate time" hypothesis while the second category entails making an analogy between professional teacher education and other professional schools.

The Inadequate Time Hypothesis

A typical example of this argument is Denemark and Nutter's (1984) characterization of a primary obstacle to the reform of teacher education:

> This chapter deals with one of the main obstacles--inadequate resources for teacher education--and, in particular, with the inadequate time available for effective teacher education within the existing institutional patterns. (p. 204)

Looking over a variety of rationales for extended teacher preparation, Schwanke (1981) concludes:

> Those supporting extended programs thus emphasize that preservice programs are artificially constrained within four years, and cannot produce fully competent teachers within these limits. (p. 54)

While Schwanke was summarizing recent rationales for extended preparation, he could just as easily have been speaking of earlier discussions. A half century ago, Counts (1935) argued for extended preparation on the basis that the dramatic social and economic changes of his day required better educated teachers to interpret these developments to students.

Reviewing the extended preparation rationales promulgated in the first half of the twentieth century, Von Schlichten (1958) concludes:

> The dominant reason offered in justification of the proposals which have been made is that the needed skills, knowledge, and understanding now require five years for their acquisition or development. (p. 49)

Clearly, the inadequate time hypothesis has been a major element in the case for extended teacher preparation.

But at various points in the twentieth century, differing areas of skill and knowledge have been viewed as inadequately developed through the conventional four-year program. These potential areas

of deficiency coincide with the three types of expertise we typically associate with teacher preparation: general education, subject matter preparation, and professional education. In turn, I will look at each of these three areas, focusing on how significant the deficiency is viewed as being and how persuasive the case for this purported deficiency is.

In the case of general education, proponents of extended teacher preparation often recommend a general education similar to that obtained by other college graduates. Typical of this position is Atkin (1985), who argues that teachers cannot claim authority if most members of the general public believe their education is stronger than that received by teachers. Taking into account the relatively high college-attendance rate of the American public, Atkin concludes that "teachers should have a bachelor's degree that is considered as rigorous as anyone else's. That is, their general education should be just as strong as that required of other college graduates" (p. 2).

The appropriateness and validity of Atkin's argument is hard to evaluate. First, in those cases in which prospective teachers are housed in the college of arts and sciences, there is no difference between the general education received by teachers and that received by other arts and science students. Second, Atkin's appeal is partly to the status a stronger general education allegedly would bestow upon teachers, and it is difficult to know whether increased

status for teachers is indeed correlated with increased general education requirements for prospective teachers.

But Atkin also claims that an equivalent general education requirement for teachers and other students is desirable if we want the public to view teaching as "an occupation demanding intellectual skills" (p. 2). This claim presumes the general education in today's higher education institutions is a substantial academic experience which prepares teachers for the dimension of their work which is "intellectual, moral, social, and cultural" in origin (Gideonse, 1984, p. 3). Yet Atkin (1985) explicitly states that in making the case for the strengthening of general education requirements for teachers he is making "no defense of what passes for general education at most universities" (p. 2). Atkin's restiveness about the current condition of liberal arts education is widely shared and has recently been the subject of a major national report sponsored by the Association of American Colleges (Select Committee, 1985). This report suggests that all students receive a minimum required program of study, focusing on nine objectives or criteria; the emphasis ought not be on expanding so-called distribution requirements but rather on intellectual experiences which directly address the nine criteria.

If we merely require more liberal arts courses of prospective teachers, the value of such work is dubious. A recent study of course selection suggests that students tend to choose their

electives on the grounds of how undemanding these courses are (Galambos, Cornett, & Spitler, 1985, as cited in Hawley, 1985, p. 17). Such a finding, though not unexpected, is nevertheless disturbing. Now, as in the past, a major difference between many four-year and extended teacher preparation programs is the increased number of general education electives available to the prospective teacher in extended programs. Thus Conant's (1963) cautions about the value of general education electives in the teacher education curricula of the 1960s bears repeating today:

> The issue between four-year and five-year continuous programs turns on the value one attaches to free electives. And if a parent feels that an extra year to enable the future teacher to wander about and sample academic courses is worth the cost, I should not be the person to condemn this use of money. But I would, as a taxpayer, vigorously protest the use of tax money for a fifth year of what I consider dubious value (p. 204).

We must ask ourselves whether more general education electives are really in the best interests of prospective teachers or whether a more important undertaking is not the rethinking and regeneration of that general education undertaken by undergraduates in teacher education.

A second area where advocates of extended teacher preparation recommend increased work is in the subject matter(s) to be taught. Most often these recommendations are made for elementary teachers, most of whom currently major in education. Proposals vary, but frequently elementary teachers are expected to major as an undergraduate in an "academic" subject (preferably one taught in the

elementary school) and to do substantial course work in other subjects typically in the curriculum of the self-contained elementary classroom. Prospective secondary teachers not only are to complete an academic undergraduate major but also often are to engage in added graduate study in this subject.

The common thread which runs through these recommendations is that prospective teachers in extended programs should increase their subject matter study over that required in the typical four-year preparation program. Generally, this increased study is defended on the basis that subject matter competence is essential to the conduct of the intellectual operations at the core of teaching. However, Atkin (1985) also makes a status-based argument for more subject matter study by teachers. He believes that if teachers are to obtain the respect of the general public, they must have an education at least as strong as everyone else's. In looking at the recommendation for added subject matter study, I will focus not so much on the status such added study might give to teachers but rather on the intellectual value of this supplemental subject matter study.

On the surface, it seems self-evident that added subject matter study would be of substantial value to the prospective teacher. There is evidence, however, that added subject matter study does not contribute to more effective teaching, unless this coursework is in advanced courses (Druva & Anderson, 1983). Hawley (1985) attempts

to interpret this puzzling finding:

> This last point seems counterintuitive but it may suggest that once one has a dozen courses or so in one's field, it is not the number of courses, nor the grades one gets in them that are important, but whether one understands fundamental principles and the structure of the discipline or body of knowledge involved (cf. Leinhardt and Smith, 1985). (p. 16)

Is it possible that only in advanced academic work is the student exposed to the fundamental principles and structure(s) of a discipline?

There is indeed evidence that introductory study in a field usually does not reveal the essential structure(s) of a discipline. Atkin (1985) recounts his own experience as an undergraduate chemistry major to illustrate the intellectual deficiencies of introductory course work:

> I proceeded in my chemistry course-sequence on faith, without feeling particularly knowledgeable about the subject as it was conceived by those who knew it best. That is, I had no clear idea of which concepts were most fundamental, which had the most explanatory power, which were relatively transient, which were most likely to offer a foundation for future developments.... Like many other undergraduate majors, I didn't see the forest for the trees. It was not until my 24th semester hour of chemistry, when I took physical chemistry, that the field began to reveal some coherence to me, and I began to understand which knowledge within chemistry was of the most worth. (p. 3)

My own undergraduate experience is similar to that of Atkin, except that I never felt I had much insight into the nature of history--particularly into the methodology employed by historians--until I began graduate study in history. The Association of American

Colleges report (Select Committee, 1985) concludes that the problem with the American college curriculum is not that knowledge is ignored but rather that the curriculum "offers too much knowledge with too little attention to how that knowledge has been created and what methods and styles of inquiry have led to its creation" (p. 24).

The typical undergraduate major is not so much intended to reveal the fundamental concepts and structure(s) of a field as to prepare the student for subsequent serious study of a discipline at the graduate level. Generally the assumption is made that considerable background material needs to be covered before the student, perhaps late in undergraduate study or more likely early in graduate study, can commence study of fundamental disciplinary ideas and can conduct inquiry in the style characteristic of that discipline. It is precisely this understanding of core ideas and of inquiry processes which the prospective teacher needs, if he or she is to be able to teach youngsters something more than bits and pieces of disconnected knowledge. In particular, the prospective teacher needs to understand how knowledge is verified in a discipline, both so that these epistemological processes can be introduced to elementary and secondary students and so that the teacher can place proper restrictions on the certainty of disciplinary knowledge.

Added subject matter study for teachers is thus of doubtful value, especially when it occurs at the undergraduate level. This is precisely what would occur if extended teacher preparation involved the pursuit of a baccalaureate degree with little or no professional work during the first four years. Secondary teachers might profit somewhat if their undergraduate majors were supplemented by graduate-level study in the discipline. But prospective elementary teachers are unlikely to benefit from expanded undergraduate study, as this study will be composed primarily of introductory courses. All that such increased study is likely to do is to clutter the mind of prospective elementary teachers with strings of unrelated facts and theories. That this increased knowledge is going to yield better elementary teachers is questionable, though many elementary teachers could no doubt profit from additional subject matter study of the proper kind.

The third area in which four-year programs are seen as inadequate is professional education. Denemark and Nutter (1984) employ a widely accepted argument when they assert that the growing knowledge base in professional education justifies moving to extended teacher preparation programming:

> The adequacy of education's base of knowledge is central to the case for extended programs of teacher preparation. Is the base sufficient to support an extended, fully professional initial preparation program for teachers.... We believe the present base of knowledge justifies lengthening and reforming initial teacher-preparation programs. (p. 213)

Typically this knowledge base is presumed to be most appropriately located at the graduate level (e.g., Atkin, 1985; Boyer, 1983; Gideonse, 1984), but there are many who argue for integrating professional and academic study throughout five or six years of university study (e.g., Andrew, 1981; Dunbar, 1981; Scannell & Guenther, 1981).

In reality, the discussion of the professional education component of teacher preparation has little bearing on the rationale for extending teacher education beyond four years. For one thing, few, if any, argue that someone who is a postbaccalaureate student, and thus a year or two older than the typical undergraduate, is prepared to study a professional curriculum which is considerably more sophisticated and demanding than that which an undergraduate can handle. Second, graduate courses in preservice teacher education are not likely to differ significantly in rigor and quality from undergraduate courses since the same faculty members would be responsible for both levels of instruction (Hawley, 1985). Third, even if there were to be a special graduate faculty in education and even if the postbaccalaureate student were to be able to tackle a very sophisticated professional curriculum, the application of this content to classroom settings is an extraordinarily complex process (Cohn, 1981). Lastly, if unnecessary and redundant content were to be eliminated from the current undergraduate professional curriculum, then there should be

room for the professional knowledge base within the present undergraduate curriculum (Cronin, 1983; Gallegos, 1981).

All of these considerations suggest that the knowledge base for professional education--which supposedly is growing rapidly--is not really key to the rationale for extended teacher preparation. On the contrary, it is the increased emphasis on general education and subject matter preparation which is central to the case for expanding teacher education beyond the "inadequate time" provided by the four-year curriculum. It just happens that many advocates of extended teacher preparation choose to place the professional curriculum at the graduate level.

The Professional School Analogy

The fundamental reason that many educators and policy makers place the professional curriculum at the graduate level is related to a second category of arguments for extended teacher preparation programming. This cluster of arguments can be characterized as the professional school analogy. Here are two instances of this reasoning:

> It is now time in the evolution of teaching as a profession to insist that the prerequisite for entry into a professional teacher-training program be the successful completion of a sound undergraduate education centering on the liberal arts. Schools of medicine, law, and veterinary medicine require their applicants to be educated persons before they begin their professional studies. Should education ask less? (Soltis & Timpane, 1984, p. 24)

> The five-year program may also be seen as a necessary element in winning recognition of professional status for the practicing teacher--and professional school status for the beleaguered education college. The professions of law, medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy have all expanded beyond an undergraduate education of four years. (Murray, 1982, p. 4)

Von Schlichten (1958) has traced similar reasoning back as far as 1905 when Dexter argued that our high school teachers cannot "attain the status of professional respectability which should be theirs, until they have invested at least four years' time in the academic side of college work, with at least one year's graduate work directed largely to a theoretical and practical study of school problems" (p. 42).

Would having autonomous professional schools of education help establish elementary and secondary school teaching as a profession? Would such a development bring increased status to colleges of education by removing them from the stigma of being associated with undergraduate education? Probably not. Attaining the status of a profession is a complex affair related only in part to the organizational structure of the training institutions or to the educational level of the trainee (Hawley, 1985, pp. 12-13). Societal attitudes toward the value of the service provided by the teacher, public doubt about the effectiveness of schooling, severe limitations on the professional autonomy of teachers, disagreeable working conditions for teachers, all these factors affect the prestige associated with elementary and secondary teachers (Judge,

1982, pp. 29-31). Thus even if a college of education were to augment its status by disconnecting itself from undergraduate education and becoming solely a professional school, the effect of this structural change on the status of teachers is problematic.

At the same time, the movement of the college of education to autonomous professional school standing disassociates professional teacher training from the undergraduate college of arts and sciences. This break is undesirable because the general education and specialized subject matter preparation of teachers is--or ought to be--much more closely connected to their professional training than is the case for other professions. "The knowledge base needed for the study of education," notes Hatfield (1984), "ranges across the entire university curriculum to a much greater extent than is the case in preparation programs for law and medicine" (p. 13). Hatfield proceeds to argue that the preparation of teachers must be seen as representing "an all-university responsibility far beyond the control of an autonomous school of education" (p. 13).

The inevitable interconnection of the professional and academic in teacher preparation has long been argued. An eloquent statement of this position was made more than a half century ago by Judd (1930):

> The situation in which education finds itself is unique, because it is at one and the same time a professional subject and an academic subject. The meaning of this statement will be clear if one contrasts education with such a purely professional subject as law. Law has a body of subject matter peculiar to itself. The line can be

> drawn between courses in torts and courses in political science or political economy without involving any serious overlapping. On the other hand, when education is administered to a prospective teacher it is very difficult, if not impossible, to make a sharp distinction between the subject which the teacher is going to teach and the professional courses which he pursues in preparing himself for his work. For example, a person who is going to teach history must study history first of all, and he must be competent in the subject matter of that department or he will not be professionally equipped. In a very proper sense of the word history is a professional subject. (p. 174)

Judd concludes that "education must be defined as only quasi-professional in character. It is much more closely related to the whole range of subjects taught in the schools than these subjects are to one another" (p. 174).

Thus it is easier for the established professional schools to disconnect themselves from the undergraduate college of arts and sciences than for the department or college of education to do so. All the established professional schools need to do is to specify a few prerequisites which are seen as necessary to subsequent professional study, while the college of education cannot do its work unless the entire college of arts and sciences experience--general education as well as disciplinary study--is of the highest quality. Indeed, it is the college of education which ought to be in the forefront of the call for the reform of the general education curriculum and which ought to be insistent that undergraduate arts and science majors ground students in the fundamental ideas and inquiry processes of each discipline.

All of these points about the need for coordination between the college of education and the college of arts and sciences--or for that matter with such other colleges as art, home economics, or music--may strike the reader as obvious but also as politically naive. Attempts at university-wide coordination of teacher preparation have not been notably successful, and attempts to arrive at mechanisms for such coordination seem cumbersome and not likely to succeed in the highly fragmented environment of the typical university (Tucker & Mautz, 1984). Clark (1984) characterizes the hope that we will ever get a meaningful university-wide commitment to teacher education as a "pipe dream" (p. 16) which ignores the organizational realities of the university. To support his argument he cites a variety of factors, including the low prestige associated with both undergraduate studies and professional training, with teacher education in particular, and with the teaching of "service courses" for another segment of the university. Clark presents a convincing case for the difficulty of developing a good working arrangement between the college of arts and sciences and the college of education. This difficulty is further exacerbated by the widely held belief among college professors that there is nothing much to learn about teaching that cannot be picked up on the job.

Thus I am not sanguine that cooperation between the college of education and the college of arts and sciences will come about easily. Extraordinary effort will be required, but such effort

seems justified. The argument that education ought to be a professional school similar to law, medicine, dentistry and others is, at root, a false analogy. Education, as Judd argued fifty-five years ago, is a quasi-professional field, at once both professional and academic. While political realities on university campuses may make the realization of this hybrid status very difficult, we need to make the effort to maintain a dual commitment to the academic and professional heritage of teacher preparation.

The Hidden Costs of Extended Teacher Preparation

One way to raise questions about the wisdom of a particular teacher education policy is to confront its rationale directly, as I have attempted to do in the first section of this paper. There I have addressed two types of reasons which are used to support the call for moving to extended teacher preparation programs, namely, 1) that four years is an inadequate length of time to prepare elementary and secondary teachers and 2) that the college of education ought to be placed on a par with postbaccalaureate professional schools. A second way to raise questions about mandating extended teacher preparation is to look at negative developments which may result from the adoption of this policy. In this section I will look at four areas where mandating extended preparation may entail hidden costs: 1) Encouraging a focus on procedural issues; 2) Narrowing the talent pool of prospective teachers; 3) Reducing the diversity of colleges/universities

offering teacher education; and 4) Neglecting the financial implications of adopting extended teacher preparation. While these topics are at times overlapping, I have separated them in order to facilitate discussion and analysis.

Encouraging a Focus on Procedural Issues

To focus the issue on the advisability of adopting extended teacher preparation--as most proponents of extended teacher preparation do--leads to a procedural rather than a substantive debate. That is, the issue becomes which of two structures--four-year or extended teacher preparation--is superior. Some people marshal arguments in favor of the way teacher preparation is currently conducted, while others argue for an alternative approach which involves a longer time period. One structure for preparing teachers gets compared to another.

Typically, during the comparison of contrasting structures the substantive reasons for making a structural change (or not doing so) are not given significant attention. Neither is much attention generally devoted to underlying assumptions. It is not unusual for the discussion quickly to move to implementation problems--another procedural concern (e.g., Kunkel & Dearmin, 1981, p. 21). Lost in all the discussion are the purposes and ends particular structures are to help realize (Zeichner, 1983). Issues of means tend to take precedence over more fundamental issues of ends.

The procedural emphasis occurs, I believe, because of the way the question is initially framed: a comparison of two teacher preparation structures. To avoid--or at least to mitigate--a procedural focus, the initial question needs to be directed to substantive concerns. Instead of asking whether extended preparation is better than four-year preparation, or vice versa, the initial question ought to be directed toward identifying and explaining just what is wrong with our current approach to teacher education (e.g., Murray, 1982; Zeichner, 1985). Starting from this point should lead toward issues of substance and goals, and underlying assumptions, as does Clark (1984) in his analysis of the context of teacher education. Even though Clark ends up suggesting a set of structural reforms (professional teacher education at the graduate level, increased funding for professional education, etc.), he makes these recommendations only after a careful and detailed analysis of the factors which have impaired the development of the field of teacher education.

A hidden cost of the movement toward extended teacher education, therefore, is the way the issue has been framed in procedural terms. Asking whether extended preparation is superior to four-year preparation encourages relatively superficial analysis of these contrasting structures. While such procedural discussion is far too common in teacher education, there is no justification for an issue as important as the ends and means of our programs to

become mired in discussion which often omits or downplays fundamental substantive issues.

Narrowing the Talent Pool of Prospective Teachers

Proponents of extended teacher preparation believe that such an approach would eventually attract more talented people into the occupation of teaching. In general, graduate-level teacher preparation is assumed to give teaching more prestige and thus make teaching a more attractive occupation. Many proponents of extended programming also advocate higher salaries, though such salary increases are an issue independent of adopting extended teacher preparation.

One problem in assessing the impact of mandated extended teacher preparation on the talent pool is that societal forces--as opposed to economic and prestige incentives--have often played a major role in attracting talented people to a career in teaching. Shanker (cited in Fox, 1984), for example, argues that three major historical factors have drawn excellent people into classroom teaching: the Depression, draft deferments for teachers during the Viet Nam War, and limited employment opportunities for women. Two of these forces no longer apply, and women increasingly have opportunities in other fields, often at considerably higher salaries than teaching. Societal forces which have subsidized recruitment are not as potent as in the past.

Today, more than in the past, the financial cost of entering the teaching profession is likely to be carefully scrutinized by prospective teachers. A number of policy makers and teacher educators (e.g., Cronin, 1983; Rule & Stanton, 1984; Schwanke, 1981) have questioned whether qualified applicants are going to be willing to invest five or six years in preparation for a relatively low paying occupation. Moreover, survey data from Ohio suggest that given a choice between four- and five-year preparation programs, about 90 per cent of preservice undergraduates and about 60 per cent of practicing teachers would opt for four-year as opposed to five-year programs, but about 90 percent of both preservice and in-service teachers said they would attend extended programs, if these programs were mandated and led to a Master's degree (Cyphert & Ryan, 1984). However, two five-year programs with significant histories--one ten years and the other twenty years--both experienced drops in enrollment when the five-year program replaced the four-year effort (Andrew, 1981; Dunbar, 1981). In summary, there is cause for concern that adopting an extended format might reduce--perhaps significantly--the enrollment in teacher education programs.

One group which seems particularly vulnerable if extended programming were to become universal is low income and minority students. Many teacher educators express concern that mandating extended programs might dramatically reduce access to the profession by such students (e.g., Cronin, 1983; Cyphert & Ryan, 1984;

Gallegos, 1981), but data on this issue are limited. Andrew (1981) suggests that some students have been excluded from New Hampshire's five-year program "on the basis of economic status" (p. 43), but he is not clear on the magnitude of this problem. However, at a time when the school-aged population increasingly comes from minority groups, we ought not be implementing teacher education policies which threaten to reduce the teacher role models available to these minority students. I fear that the most talented among minority and low income prospective teachers will be the first to be driven away from the profession by the adoption of extended teacher preparation, since these talented students will have the easiest access to alternative occupations.

Another group which appears vulnerable to the institutionalization of extended teacher preparation is students from selective liberal arts colleges. At many of these schools, teacher education in a four-year format is already in a tenuous position (Travers, 1980), and the movement to extended teacher preparation would probably force many of these institutions to drop teacher preparation. Survey data suggest that only one-third of the private institutions in Ohio are sure that they would continue to offer teacher education should five-year teacher education be mandated in that state (Cyphert & Ryan, 1984).

Some do argue that students from liberal arts colleges can continue to prepare to become teachers by taking their general

education and academic majors at liberal arts colleges, with the professional work to be completed at graduate-level professional schools of education (Clark, 1984; Gideonse, 1984). However, if prospective teachers from liberal arts institutions do not have the opportunity to participate in early field experiences--and there is no reason to assume liberal arts colleges would make such opportunities available--a major magnet for attracting individuals to teaching would be lost (Hawley, 1985, p. 7).

While extended teacher preparation may well decrease the talent pool, it is also possible that the personal commitment required by a longer preparation program will encourage a higher percentage of teachers-in-training to enter the job market than is the case for graduates of four-year programs. Such an outcome did occur when New Hampshire moved from a four-year to an extended program (Andrew, 1981, p. 42), but no data are available on the longevity of the teaching careers of students prepared in extended programs.

On balance, there is cause for concern that mandating extended teacher preparation--or employing it on a wide scale--will have detrimental effects on the quality of the talent pool entering teaching. In recent years there has been widespread concern about the quality of the teaching force, but the adoption of more severe "screens" to entry--for example, entry tests, internships, and, of course, extended teacher preparation--is unlikely to have much desirable impact on the talent pool entering teaching unless there

is concurrent attention to the "magnets"--for example, training scholarships, pay differentials for teachers, career ladders--needed to draw and hold talented and energetic individuals to a teaching career (Sykes, 1983).

Reducing the Diversity of Colleges/Universities Offering Teacher Educations

There is a consensus of opinion among policy analysts that the widespread implementation of extended teacher preparation would reduce the diversity of institutions offering teacher preparation (e.g., Clark, 1984; Hawley, 1985). In particular, extended programming would tend to reduce the number of liberal arts colleges which would offer teacher preparation (Cyphert & Ryan, 1984; Hawley, 1985, pp. 7-8), a development which leads heads of teacher education programs in independent colleges to be far less enthusiastic about extended programs than their counterparts in state-supported institutions (Baker, 1984). While there are a few liberal arts colleges which have already converted to an extended program format (e.g., Austin College, Allegheny College), most liberal arts colleges would probably phase out their teacher education programs under a mandate for extended teacher preparation.

Some argue that this development would be desirable, as liberal arts colleges could then concentrate on providing subject matter and general education preparation for prospective teachers, a role which these colleges may be able to fulfill better than large, public,

research-oriented universities (Gideonse, 1984). Meanwhile these universities, along with some research-oriented private universities, could assume the responsibility for graduate-level professional preparation of teachers. Little might be lost by eliminating small programs in liberal arts colleges as such programs often represent a bland sameness rather than the diversity and richness often claimed for these efforts (Clark, 1984, pp. 10, 18-19; Joyce & Clift, 1984).

On the other hand, other policy analysts cite several reasons for maintaining teacher education in liberal arts institutions. Already discussed are the talented students in many of these institutions, students who are unlikely to defer their interest in teaching until postbaccalaureate professional education. Concern has also been expressed about the implications of high status private colleges and universities abandoning teacher education (Hawley, 1985, p. 8). Lastly, liberal arts colleges are often viewed as good environments for the conduct of professional education because their relatively small size facilitates the development of both an integrated professional curriculum and a personalized relationship among students and faculty and because these institutions emphasize the ethical basis of teaching (Rule & Stanton, 1984).

The pros and cons of the value of maintaining professional preparation within liberal arts institutions are hard to evaluate.

There is a blandness and similarity among all teacher education programs, but accrediting agencies and state certification requirements are responsible for much of the standardization of programs across institutions (Conant, 1963; Joyce & Clift, 1984). How much would liberal arts colleges deviate from the deadening sameness of today's professional curriculum if certification and accreditation standards were less prescriptive? We do not know. Neither is it clear whether the talented prospective teachers in many selective liberal arts colleges overbalance the weaker prospective teachers from some non-selective liberal arts colleges. Nor can we easily judge the effect of high status colleges abandoning teacher preparation. Thus I conclude that the hidden cost of liberal arts colleges abandoning teacher preparation is less easy to assess than is believed by either the proponents or opponents of this development.

Neglecting the Cost Implications of Adopting Extended Teacher Preparation

Nothing is more obvious than that extending the preparation period for teachers is an expensive proposition. Advocates and opponents alike grant this fact, and the concerns about cost have arisen whenever there has been major interest in extended programming (e.g., Andrew, 1981; Cogan, 1955; Miller, 1939; Soltis & Timpane, 1984; Winetrout, 1963). Yet the specific costs of extended preparation have rarely been analyzed with sufficient care.

These costs can be seen as occurring at three levels: the individual candidate, the institution, and the larger society. At all three levels, the costs are substantial, and the implications of these costs sizable.

For the individual, Hawley (1985) estimates the cost of added tuition at a public institution and foregone first-year earnings at almost $20,000 (considerably higher if the student attends a private institution). Unless there is a concurrent increase in scholarships and other entry-level subsidies, there likely will be an overall drop in the quality of the talent pool, perhaps a precipitous drop in the case of low income and minority students. Unfortunately, state legislatures are more inclined to establish "screens" to entering teaching than to create such "magnets" as scholarships and student loans; screens are much less expensive to implement than magnets (Sykes, 1983).

At the institutional level, the costs are extremely difficult to calculate because multiple factors interact. Is the education faculty currently underutilized or fully utilized? Will the extended program have an internship which requires careful supervision? Will the extended program abandon the predominant lecture format so common in four-year programs and move toward a labor-intensive clinically oriented program (e.g., Andrew, 1981)?

The societal cost is somewhat easier to assess. Certainly the taxpayer is going to have to assume some additional financial

burden, unless we are prepared to let extended programming reduce the quality of the teaching force. Assuming that we merely want to maintain the quality of the current teacher candidate pool and assuming that we can do this by eliminating the added costs to the student of a fifth year, the taxpayer would have to provide a subsidy of almost four billion dollars to prepare 200,000 teachers per year (Hawley, 1985). The societal cost would be reduced somewhat should private colleges and universities continue to prepare a segment of the preservice teachers, but then these institutions would bear the cost of subsidizing the added costs of a fifth year. After making other financial adjustments (e.g., higher first year salaries for teachers who start with a Master's degree, increased university services for the fifth year, etc.), Hawley estimates the total cost of implementing a fifth-year Master's program nationwide at almost six billion dollars. Even if Hawley's assumptions are challenged--and they can be--do we really think that American society is prepared to pay considerably more than now for preservice teacher education? Or perhaps more importantly, should we not consider alternative uses of these funds for such policy initiatives as higher teacher salaries or intensive in-service education?

Pluralism in Structures

In this paper, there is no ringing endorsement of four-year teacher preparation. In fact, I believe that there are a number of

problems with present-day teacher education, problems which ought to be identified, delineated, and addressed. To do so, however, goes beyond the scope of this paper (see, for example, Zeichner, 1985).

Most of this paper involves a discussion of the extended program format and some comparison of this structure to the conventional four-year approach. This focus on structures, of course, is exactly what I have earlier characterized as inappropriate because such structural analysis tends to overemphasize procedural issues. However, I believe that there is little choice but to address the desirability of the extended program structure, since policy makers have made the choice between a four-year and an extended format a key issue in the reform agenda for teacher education. To fail to address the issue of extended teacher preparation is to fail to be seen as concerned about the improvement of teacher education.

What I have attempted to do is to penetrate beyond the surface arguments about the virtues of extended teacher preparation and to challenge its fundamental rationale. Thus considerable attention is directed to the "inadequate time" hypothesis, especially to whether lengthening the study of general education, academic subjects, and professional education is an important reform. Particular attention is given to general education and subject matter preparation, as these two areas are widely viewed as too small in scope. On the contrary, I have argued, the problem with general education is its

quality and coherence, not its length. Further, additional academic study is not as important as reorganizing this study so its focus is more on core disciplinary ideas and inquiry processes. Thus a reasonable case can be made that the rethinking of general education and subject matter preparation is a far more significant reform than the expansion of either of these areas of study. Similarly, the present size of the professional curriculum may well be sufficient for the pedagogical knowledge which has been developed in recent years, providing redundant and unnecessary professional content is removed from the current professional curriculum.

At the same time, there is no reason to believe that housing professional education in an autonomous postbaccalaureate professional school is a wise idea. Establishing an autonomous professional school structure is not likely to augment the status of the occupation of teaching. Moreover, such a professional school of education tends to artificially separate the academic and professional aspects of teaching. Instead of disassociating itself from undergraduate arts and sciences instruction, the department or school of education ought to support the reform of the arts and sciences curriculum and seek to regenerate the professional aspect of teacher preparation.

If this critical analysis of the rationale for extended teacher preparation seems problematic, then the hidden costs of mandating extended teacher preparation need to be considered. To mandate

extended preparation is to encourage a focus on procedural issues, to narrow the talent pool for teachers, to reduce the diversity of colleges/universities offering teacher education, and to neglect the financial implications of adopting extended preparation. While there is room for debate about the severity of these hidden costs, they do raise questions about the wisdom of implementing extended teacher preparation on a wide scale.

The proper policy to pursue is to work at improving the quality of teacher preparation. We ought to address the quality of general education and subject matter education, as well as to address the quality of professional education. Key questions concern the ends and purposes of teaching and teacher education--where we confront what Zeichner (1983) calls alternative paradigms--as well as issues concerning the coherence of general education and the extent to which subject matter preparation entails the fundamental study of a discipline. Some may find it congenial to pursue reform of teacher education within an extended format; others may believe needed changes can be made within the traditional four-year structure.

While we can hope that research on the efficacy of four-year and extended formats might indicate which structure is superior, the relative value of the two structures has been at issue for many years. Which structure is better is likely to remain contested; both structures should be possible.

****
Critical comment welcomed. Please send such reactions to the author at Campus Box 1183, Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63130.
****

Reference List

Andrew, M. D. (1981). A five year teacher education program: Success and challenges. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (3), 40-43.

Atkin, J. M. (1985, Summer). Preparing to go to the head of the class. The Wingspread Journal (Special Section on Teacher Education), pp. 1-3.

Baker, T. E. (1984). Extended teacher education programs: A survey of attitudes in Texas. Teacher Education & Practice, 1 (2), 43-50.

Boyer, E. L. (1983). High school. New York: Harper & Row.

Clark, D. L. (1984). Transforming the contexture for the professional preparation of teachers. Prepared for publication in Advances in teacher education (Vol. 2), L. G. Katz and J. D. Raths (Eds.).

Cogan, M. (1955). "Master of Arts in Teaching" at Harvard University. Journal of Teacher Education, 6 (2), 135-142.

Cohn, M. (1981). A new model for linking theory to practice. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (3), 26-30.

Conant, J. B. (1963). The education of American teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Counts, G. S. (1935). Presentday reasons for requiring a longer period of pre-service preparation for teachers. National Education Association Proceedings, 73, 694-701.

Cronin, J. M. (1983). State regulation of teacher preparation. In L. S. Shulman and G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 171-191). New York: Longman.

Cyphert, F. R., & Ryan, K. A. (1984). Extending initial teacher preparation: Some issues and answers. Action in Teacher Education, 6 (1-2), 63-70.

Denemark, G., & Nutter, N. (1984). The case for extended programs of initial teacher preparation. In L. G. Katz and J. D. Raths (Eds.), Advances in teacher education (Vol. 1, pp. 203-246). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Druva, C. A., & Anderson, R. D. (1983). Science teacher characteristics by teacher behavior and by student outcome: A meta-analysis of research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 20 (5), 467-479.

Dunbar, J. B. (1981). Moving to a five-year teacher preparation program: The perspective of experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (1), 13-15.

Fox, J. N. (1984). Restructuring the teacher work force to attract the best and the brightest. Journal of Education Finance, 10, 214-237.

Galambos, E. C., Cornett, L. M., & Spitler, H. D. (1985). An analysis of transcripts of teachers and arts and science graduates. Atlanta: Southern Regional Educational Board.

Gallegos, A. M. (1981). The dilemma of extended/five year programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (1), 4-6.

Gideonse, H. D. (1984). A future role for liberal arts colleges in the preparation of teachers. In A. R. Tom (Ed.), Teacher education in liberal arts settings: Achievements, realities, and challenges (pp. 1-11). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education.

Hatfield, R. C. (1984, August 29). Professional-school approach is too narrow for teacher preparation [Letter to the editor]. Education Week, p. 13.

Hawley, W. D. (1985). Breaking away: The risks and inadequacy of extended teacher preparation programs. Nashville, TN: Peabody Center for Effective Teaching, Vanderbilt University.

Holmes, H. W. (1937). Shall teachers be scholars? (Occasional pamphlet No. 1). Cambridge: Graduate School of Education, Harvard University.

Joyce, B., & Clift, R. (1984). The Phoenix agenda: Essential reform in teacher education. Educational Researcher, 13 (4), 5-18.

Judd, C. H. (1930). The school of education. In R. A. Kent (Ed.), Higher education in America (pp. 157-191). Boston: Ginn.

Judge, H. (1982). American graduate schools of education: A view from abroad. New York: Ford Foundation.

Kunkel, R. C., & Dearmin, E. T. (1981). The political and ideological development of a fifth year statewide internship. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (1), 19-23.

Leinhardt, G., & Smith, D. (1985). Expertise in mathematics instruction subject matter knowledge. Journal of Educational Psychology, 77, 247-271.

Miller, J. H. (1939). The five-year teacher training program and the small college. School and Society, 49 (No. 1266), 418-420.

Murray, J. S. (1982). The extended program for teacher training: A procedural critique. Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (5), 2-5.

Rule, A. M., & Stanton, C. M. (1984). Excellence in teacher education: The liberal arts perspective. In A. R. Tom (Ed.), Teacher education in liberal arts settings: Achievements, realities and challenges (pp. 13-20). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education.

Sarason, S. B., Davidson, K. S., & Blatt, B. (1962). The preparation of teachers: An unstudied problem in education.

New York: John Wiley.

Scannell, D. P., & Guenther, J. E. (1981). The development of an extended program. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (1), 7-12.

Schwanke, D. (1981). Extended preservice programs: Assessing the argument. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (1) 54-55.

Select Committee of the Association of American Colleges. (1985). Integrity in the college curriculum: A report to the academic community. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

Smith, D. C., Carroll, R. G., & Fry, B. (1984). PROTEACH: Professional teacher preparation at the Univeristy of Florida. Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (2), 134-135.

Smith, B. O. (1980). A design for a school of pedagogy. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education.

Soltis, J. F., & Timpane, M. (1984, May 2). Cultivating a community of teaching. Education Week, pp. 24; 19.

Sykes, G. (1983). Public policy and the problem of teacher quality. In L. S. Shulman and G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 97-125). New York: Longman.

Travers, E. F. (1980). The case for teacher education at selective liberal arts colleges. Phi Delta Kappan, 62 (2), 127-131.

Tucker, A., & Mautz, R. B. (1984). Solving the teacher education problem: A university-wide obligation. Educational Record, 65 (2), 34-37.

Von Schlichten, E. W. (1958). Idea and practice of a fifth-year requirement for teacher certification. Teachers College Record, 60 (1), 41-53.

White, J. E. (1985, September 18). How we arrived at five-year teacher education. Education Week, p. 24.

Winetrout, K. (1963). In defense of the four-year program in teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 44 (4), 183-184.

Woodring, P. (1957). New directions in teacher education. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Zeichner, K. M. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (3), 3-18.

Zeichner, K. M. (1985). Preparation for elementary school teaching. In P. J. Burke and R. G. Heideman (Eds.), Career-long teacher education (pp. 62-97). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.